

# Implicit Regularization for Multi-label Feature Selection

Dou El Kefel Mansouri, Khalid Benabdeslem and Seif-Eddine Benkabou

**Abstract**—In this paper, we address the problem of feature selection in the context of multi-label learning, by using a new estimator based on implicit regularization and label embedding. Unlike the sparse feature selection methods that use a penalized estimator with explicit regularization terms such as  $l_{2,1}$ -norm, MCP or SCAD, we propose a simple alternative method via Hadamard product parameterization. In order to guide the feature selection process, a latent semantic of multi-label information method is adopted, as a label embedding. Experimental results on some known benchmark datasets suggest that the proposed estimator suffers much less from extra bias, and may lead to benign overfitting.

**Index Terms**—Feature selection, Multi-label learning, Implicit regularization, Hadamard product parameterization.



## 1 INTRODUCTION

Multi-label learning focuses on the problem that each instance is associated with multiple class labels simultaneously [1], [2], [3], which is ubiquitous in many real-world applications, such as image annotation [4], [5], [6], text categorization [7], [8], and gene function classification [9], [10]. Similar to single-label learning, high-dimensional data with an enormous amount of redundant features significantly increases the computational burden of multi-label learning, which could also lead to over-fitting and performance degradation of learning algorithms [11].

To deal with this problem, feature selection represents a very effective way to alleviate the curse of dimensionality by selecting the most informative feature subsets from the original set. Many multi-label feature selection algorithms have been proposed to find a lower-dimensional representation of the original feature space, which can be broadly classified into transformation based methods that transform the multi-label data into either one or more single-label data subsets [12], [13], and direct methods that adapt the popular learning techniques to multi-label setting, without requiring any preprocessing [14], [15], [16]. In the first category, feature selection approaches can be used directly as filter like Fisher score [17], wrapper like sequential feature selection [18] or embedded like lasso [19]. In the second category, the feature selection approaches are revised in order to handle the multi-label parameter. We note in this category, the Robust Feature Selection (RFS) based on  $l_{2,1}$ -norm regularization [20], the Multi-label dimensionality reduction method (MDDM) [21], the Multi-label Informed Feature Selection (MIFS) [22], the Multi-label feature selection algorithm based on ant Colony Optimization (MLACO) [23], the ensemble method for semi-supervised multi-label feature selection (3-3FS) [24] and the Global and Local Feature Selection (GLFS) [25], not to mention more.

Particularly, sparse feature selection methods in the context of multi-label learning have a great deal of attention in recent years. Thanks to their estimators with explicit regularization schemes, like  $l_{2,1}$ -norm [20],  $l_{2,1/2}$ -norm [26], MCP [27] or SCAD [28], the effect of the curse of dimensionality has been greatly mitigated and the learning process has been enormously improved.

**Motivation and our contribution.** Despite the success of multi-label-learning-based sparse feature selection methods, they suffer from *extra bias* due to the regularization term introduced artificially to restrict the effective size of the parameter space [29], [30]. Somewhat more clearly, adding some kind of norm constraint to an objective function of interest makes the modified optimization problem more complex. Hence, the overall estimator may be deteriorated and may not fall below the penalty level to accommodate a possibly faster convergence rate.

The aim of this paper is to propose a new estimator for multi-label feature selection, which suffers less bias than usual explicitly penalized estimators, and leads to more regular solutions. The proposed estimator is mainly based on an *implicit regularizer* used to prevent the overfitting. The implicit regularizer leads to a change-of-variable via a simple *Hadamard product parametrization* (element-wise product) [31]. The latter plays the role of explicit penalty but by transforming the penalized multi-label-learning-based sparse feature selection problem into an unconstrained smooth problem and also provides numerical stability (detail in section 3). Even if the implicit regularization has received particular attention in recent years, it has been addressed most often in the context of learning [32], [33], [34]. In a different direction, this paper considers implicit regularization outside the learning process (see section 3).

Furthermore, we used the *latent semantic analysis* in conjunction with the implicit regularization to guide the feature selection process. This choice is due to the fact that estimating the correlation between features and class labels is often difficult due to the presence of noise and unnecessary information labels in the label set. Thus, motivated by Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI) [35], [36], [37], it is possible to decompose the multi-labeled output space into a small dimension space cleaned of noise and unnecessary labels, and use this low-dimensional space to guide the feature selection process, via an implicit regularization.

Interestingly, our estimator gives rise to the *benign overfitting* phenomenon that typically occurs when the training error is significantly smaller than the test error. Although the explanation for the cause of this phenomenon remains a mystery to researchers, they are almost inclined to believe that implicit regularization is one of its mechanisms [32], [34]. They also confirm that explicit

regularization in the form  $l_1$  or  $l_2$  does not lead to its emergence [33]. Thus, we experimentally show, through this paper, that another implicit regularization effect independent of the learning process could also lead to the emergence of this phenomenon.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work considering together a label embedding and an implicit regularization in the context of the multi-label feature selection while overcoming the extra bias. The main contributions of this paper with respect to the relative literature are summarized as follows:

- 1) We propose a novel framework for multi-label feature selection, named mFSIR, i.e. **multi-label Feature Selection Implicit Regularization**.
- 2) The proposed framework is based on a new estimator that overcomes the extra bias.
- 3) The proposed estimator relies on implicit regularization via Hadamard product parametrization in conjunction with the label embedding.
- 4) We conduct experiments on some known benchmark datasets to validate our proposal with different scenarios.

**Outline.** The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews some related works on machine learning using the explicit and implicit regularization terms as well as the latent semantics analysis. Section 3 describes our proposed approach. Section 4 provides some experimental results for validating the approach on some known datasets. Section 5 draws conclusion and some future directions from this work.

## 2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we first present the explicit and the implicit regularization concepts; then, we present the concept of latent semantics of multi-label information and a brief overview of multi-label data selection approaches.

### 2.1 Explicit/implicit regularization

The literature on sparse feature selection methods in the context of multi-label learning is extensive. Jian *et al.* [22], [38]. proposed a novel multi-label informed feature selection framework called MIFS, that exploits label correlations to select discriminative features across multiple labels. He *et al.* [39] introduced a multi-label classification approach joint with label correlations, missing labels and feature selection. Hu *et al.* [40] proposed a robust multi-label feature selection with dual-graph regularization. Zhang *et al.* [16] suggested a new method that exploits both view relations and label correlations to select discriminative features for further learning. Fan *et al.* [41] proposed a manifold learning with structured subspace for multi-label feature selection. Huang *et al.* [42] introduced a Multi-label feature selection via manifold regularization and dependence maximization.

All the above-mentioned works connect an explicit regularization term to the gradient descent optimization in order to mitigate the curse of dimensionality and improve the learning process. Nevertheless, the explicit regularization is not sufficient for controlling the generalization error [43], and may lead to a less accurate estimation due to the large bias [44]. In this context, some recent work claim that regularization may also be implicit, and the generalization error may enormously improved using implicit regularization than explicit regularization. For instance, Yu *et al.* used the early stopping as an implicit regularization to improve prediction. Zhang *et al.* [43] conducted a study to

understand deep learning. They showed that explicit forms of regularization do not adequately explain the generalization error and the neural networks generalize well even without explicit regularization. Vaskevicius *et al.* [45] proposed an algorithm based on implicit regularization for sparse linear regression. They showed that, unlike explicit regularization, algorithms based on implicit regularization applied to a sparse recovery problem adapt to the problem difficulty and yield optimal statistical rates. Zhao *et al.* [46] considered implicit regularization for solving least square problems in the context of linear regression. They illustrated advantages of using implicit regularization via gradient descent over parametrization in sparse vector estimation. Recently, Li *et al.* [32]. proved that the implicit regularization could exhibit, under certain conditions, the phenomenon of benign overfitting. This was confirmed later in [34], where the authors also provided the situations in which benign overfitting can occur. Chatterji *et al.* [47] argued that the implicit regularization is essential in determining the generalization properties of the learnt model. Zhou *et al.* [33]. affirmed that one of the major explanations for benign overfitting is implicit regularization.

### 2.2 Latent Semantics of Multi-Label Information

Furthermore, Latent Semantics Analysis (LSA) was originally developed, and has been most commonly applied to, for improving information retrieval [37]. This by using dimensionality reduction techniques that preserves the information of inputs and meanwhile captures the correlations between the multiple outputs. Yu *et al.* [48] proposed a Multi-label informed Latent Semantic Indexing (MLSI) that maintains the inputs and simultaneously captures correlations between multiple output. Changqing *et al.* [49] proposed a Latent Semantic Aware Multi-view Multi-label Learning (LSA-MML) that simultaneously seeks a predictive common representation of multiple views and the corresponding projection model between the common representation and labels. Zhang *et al.* [16] introduced a technique that projects the multi-labeled information into a reduced space by using the idea of latent semantic analysis.

### 2.3 Multi-label feature selection

Multi-label feature selection approaches can be roughly split into problem transformation approaches and adaption approaches. The first category includes filters, wrappers and embedded approaches that transform the multi-label data into either one or more single-label data subsets. Most popular filter approaches are, Fisher score [17], ReliefF [50] and f-statistic [51]. Most popular wrapper approaches are, sequential feature selection [52], randomized feature selection [53], support vector machines and recursive feature elimination [53]. The commonly used embedded approaches are lasso [19], LARS [54], VS-CCPSO [55] and NLE-SLFS [56]. The second category includes approaches that adapt the popular learning techniques to multi-label setting, without requiring any pre-processing. Popular approaches in this category include: Robust Feature Selection (RFS) based on  $l_{2,1}$ -norm regularization [20], the Multi-label dimensionality reduction method (MDDM) [21], and the Multi-label Informed Feature Selection (MIFS) [22].

## 3 THE MFSIR APPROACH

In this section, we first present the notations used throughout the paper and then introduce the formulation of our proposed method mFSIR.

### 3.1 Notations

We use bold-faced symbols to denote vectors and matrices. Let  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  be the instance matrix and  $\mathbf{Y} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n] \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times q}$  be the label matrix.  $m$  represents the size of feature vectors and  $q$  represents the number of class labels  $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_q\}$ .  $\mathbf{y}_i = [y_{i1}, y_{i2}, \dots, y_{iq}] \in \{0, 1\}^q$  is a binary vector, where  $y_{ij} = 1$ , if  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is associated with the label  $c_j$  and  $y_{ij} = 0$ , otherwise. We use  $\|\cdot\|_p$  for the  $l_p$ -norm. The Frobenius norm ( $l_{2,2}$ ) is defined as:

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_F = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2 \right) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{x}_{ij}^2 \right) \right)^{1/2} \quad (1)$$

### 3.2 Problem statement

Consider the usual sparse multi-label feature selection based on an explicit regularization term [20]:

$$\Xi : \min_{\mathbf{W}} \|\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{W}) - \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 + \underbrace{\gamma \|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,1}}_{\text{explicit\_term}} \quad (2)$$

where,  $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$  is the feature coefficient matrix.  $\gamma$  is a hyper-parameter used to control the strength of the regularization with respect to the loss function. The objective of  $\Xi$  is to make  $\mathbf{W}$  well sparse, and this can be done by the second term based on the  $l_{2,1}$  norm. The bigger  $\gamma$  is, the more the coefficients of  $\mathbf{W}$  are reduced until they are exactly zero.

In fact, Eq. (2) is easy to be optimized and can have global optimal solutions. However, its explicit regularization term may expose it to large bias and thus lead it to less accurate estimation [46]. Therefore, we assume that replacing the explicit regularizer with a simple implicit regularizer can overcome the extra bias.

#### 3.2.1 Implicit regularization via Hadamard product parameterization

Here, we rely on the works of [57] and propose to replace the explicit regularization in Eq. (2) by an *implicit* one based on the *Hadamard product parametrization* (see Eq. (3)).

**Assumption 1.** *Instead of using a direct coefficient matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  to be regularized, we use the element-wise product of two matrices  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$  and  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$  that should estimate  $\mathbf{W}$ .*

From the Eq. (3), the *term 2* in  $\Xi$  is used as an explicit regularization term. Under the Assumption 1, the same term is dropped in  $\hat{\Xi}$  and implicitly introduced in the form of  $(\mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H})$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi : \underbrace{\min_{\mathbf{W}} \|\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{W}) - \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2}_{\text{term1}} + \underbrace{\gamma \|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,1}}_{\text{term2}} &\xrightarrow{\text{replaced by}} \\ \hat{\Xi} : \underbrace{\min_{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}} \|\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2}_{\text{term1}} & \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where, ' $\odot$ ' is the Hadamard (element-wise) product.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Based on [31], a change-of-variable via Hadamard product parametrization ( $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H}$ ), makes the non-smooth convex optimization problem for  $\Xi$  in Eq. (3) a smoothed optimization problem ( $\hat{\Xi}$  in Eq. (3)).*

Here, we should get  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ , the optimal values of  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{H}$ . Thus,  $\hat{\mathbf{W}} = \hat{\mathbf{G}} \odot \hat{\mathbf{H}}$  will represent the optimal value of  $\mathbf{W}$ . Details on obtaining  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$  are in section 3.3. We also take advantage of this parameterization to create structured sparsity. The following assumption are made throughout the paper.

**Assumption 2.** *Sparsity is ensured in  $\hat{\Xi}$  (Eq. (3)) if the initial values of  $\mathbf{G}$  or  $\mathbf{H}$  are superior or equal to zero.*

Since the objective of Eq. (2) is to make  $\mathbf{W}$  well sparse, we assume that this sparsity will take place if at least one of the matrices  $\mathbf{G}$  or  $\mathbf{H}$  is sparse due to the element wise product between the two matrices (see section 4.3.3).

#### 3.2.2 Latent semantic analysis

In multi-label learning, the correlation between features and class labels is often difficult to be estimated due to the presence of noise and unnecessary information labels in the label set. From this point, using latent semantics of multi-label information could be very effective to guide the feature selection process.

**Assumption 3.** *Based on [37] and [22], the multi-labeled output space  $\mathbf{Y}$  can be decomposed to a product of two low-dimensional nonnegative matrices:  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$  is the low-dimensional latent semantics matrix and  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times q}$  is the coefficient matrix of latent semantics, where  $l < q$ .*

Note that the nonnegative constraint is imposed on the decomposition phase since the latent semantic matrix obtained later will be more physically interpretable [58]. Mathematically, the decomposition is done by minimizing the following reconstruction error:

$$\min_{\mathbf{V} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{B} \geq \mathbf{0}} \|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 \quad (4)$$

To ensure that local geometry structures are consistent between the input space  $\mathbf{X}$  and the reduced low-dimensional semantics  $\mathbf{V}$ , it is important to add the following term.

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{S}_{ij} (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j)^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{V}^T (\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{S}) \mathbf{V}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{V}) \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_{ij}$  is the similarity matrix.  $\mathbf{v}_i$  is the latent semantics of  $y_i$ .  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a diagonal matrix with  $\mathbf{Z}_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{S}_{ij}$ .  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{S}$  is the graph laplacian matrix. The affinity graph  $\mathbf{S}$  is modeled by Eq. (6) [59],

$$\mathbf{S}_{ij} = \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^2}{\lambda^2}} & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_i \in N_p(\mathbf{x}_j) \text{ or } \mathbf{x}_j \in N_p(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $N_p(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the  $p$ -nearest neighbors of instance  $\mathbf{x}$ . By integrating the local geometric structure of the data, the Eq. (4) becomes:

$$\min_{\mathbf{V} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{B} \geq \mathbf{0}} \|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 + \beta \text{tr}(\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{V}) \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta$  is a regularization parameter, used to control local geometry structures.

#### 3.2.3 Objective function

To perform feature selection, we take advantage of the low-dimensional latent semantics matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  that encodes label correlations and greatly reduces the noise in the original multi-label output space. Hence, features most related to the latent semantics  $\mathbf{V}$  will be chosen. Therefore, the objective function that we

propose for multi-label feature selection and label decomposition, can be formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B} \geq \mathbf{0}} \|\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{V}\|_F^2 + \alpha \|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 + \beta \text{tr}(\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{L}\mathbf{V}) \quad (8)$$

The first term in Eq. (8) represents the *first contribution* to this paper which relates to the implicit regularization, while the second and third terms relate to the *second contribution* which is the label embedding.  $(\mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H})$  determines a feature coefficient matrix in which each row measures the importance of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  feature in approximating the latent semantics  $\mathbf{V}$ .  $\alpha$  is used to balance the second term in the equation Eq. (8).

### 3.3 Optimization algorithm

Minimizing Eq. (8) jointly over  $\mathbf{G}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  is a highly non-convex optimization problem with many saddle points, specially if the label space  $\mathbf{Y}$  is noisy. Our objective function is differentiable at each variable, and its local minimizers can be found using an efficient alternating optimization algorithm. Thus, we can apply the gradient descent with Hadamard product parameterization, by taking the derivative of the objective function w.r.t. variables  $\mathbf{G}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , respectively:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{G} := \mathbf{G} - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B}) \\ \mathbf{H} := \mathbf{H} - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B}) \\ \mathbf{V} := P[\mathbf{V} - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B})] \\ \mathbf{B} := P[\mathbf{B} - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B})] \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \nabla f_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B}) := \mathbf{H} \odot [2\mathbf{X}^T(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{V})] \\ \nabla f_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B}) := \mathbf{G} \odot [2\mathbf{X}^T(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{V})] \\ \nabla f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B}) := 2[(\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{G} \odot \mathbf{H})) + \alpha(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{Y})\mathbf{B}^T + \beta\mathbf{L}\mathbf{V}] \\ \nabla f_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B}) := 2[\alpha\mathbf{V}^T(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{Y})] \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

and  $P[\mathbf{D}]$  represents a box projection operator that maps the update  $\mathbf{D}$  to a bounded region in order to ensure the nonnegativity:

$$P[\mathbf{D}]_{ij} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{D}_{ij} & \text{if } \mathbf{D}_{ij} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

$\eta$  is a step size, used to accelerate the convergence rate and to reduce the running time of the algorithm. Note that, at each iteration, one variable is updated while fixing the other three variables since the objective function is convex when any three variables are fixed. We illustrate the optimization of Eq. (8) in Algorithm 1.

First, we apply the updating formulas in Eq. (9), with random initial values  $\mathbf{G}^0$ ,  $\mathbf{H}^0$ ,  $\mathbf{V}^0$  and  $\mathbf{B}^0$  chosen close enough to 0 in step 1. Notice that  $(0, 0, 0, 0)$  is a saddle point of the objective function, so we need to apply a small perturbation  $\varpi$  on the initial values. We then apply the updating rules [lines 2 to 8] to get  $\mathbf{G}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ . Finally, the Hadamard product between the final values obtained from the two matrices  $\mathbf{H}$  and  $\mathbf{G}$  is estimated, and the resulting norm of each row is used to evaluate the relevance of the features to be selected.

#### Algorithm 1 mFSIR

**Input:** Data matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , Label matrix  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ , Validation data:  $(\bar{\mathbf{X}}, \bar{\mathbf{Y}})$ , Parameters:  $\alpha, \beta, \varpi, \eta, T_{max}$ .  
**Output:** Final estimate  $(\hat{\mathbf{G}} \odot \hat{\mathbf{H}})$  and ranked features.

```

1: Initialize
    $[\mathbf{G}^0] \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-\varpi, \varpi), [\mathbf{H}^0] \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-\varpi, \varpi), [\mathbf{V}^0] \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-\varpi, \varpi), [\mathbf{B}^0] \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(-\varpi, \varpi)$ , iteration number  $t = 0$ ;
2: while  $t < T_{max}$  do
3:    $\mathbf{G}^{t+1} := \mathbf{G}^t - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B})$ ;
4:    $\mathbf{H}^{t+1} := \mathbf{H}^t - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B})$ ;
5:    $\mathbf{V}^{t+1} := P[\mathbf{V}^t - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B})]$ ;
6:    $\mathbf{B}^{t+1} := P[\mathbf{B}^t - \eta \nabla f_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{B})]$ ;
7:    $t = t + 1$ 
8: end
```

**Lemma 3.2.** *In the iterative process (Steps 2 to 8),  $(\mathbf{G}^{t+1}, \mathbf{H}^{t+1}, \mathbf{V}^{t+1}, \mathbf{B}^{t+1})$  tend to converge to a stationary point  $(\mathbf{G}^\infty, \mathbf{H}^\infty, \mathbf{V}^\infty, \mathbf{B}^\infty)$  of Eq. (8) that satisfies the first order optimality condition :*

$$\begin{cases} \nabla f_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{G}^\infty, \mathbf{H}^\infty, \mathbf{V}^\infty, \mathbf{B}^\infty) = 0 \\ \nabla f_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{G}^\infty, \mathbf{H}^\infty, \mathbf{V}^\infty, \mathbf{B}^\infty) = 0 \\ \nabla f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{G}^\infty, \mathbf{H}^\infty, \mathbf{V}^\infty, \mathbf{B}^\infty) = 0 \\ \nabla f_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{G}^\infty, \mathbf{H}^\infty, \mathbf{V}^\infty, \mathbf{B}^\infty) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Stationary points of Eq. (8) can be local minimum, local maximum, or saddle points. Under the Assumption 3 that the label decomposition, by  $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{B}$  allows a good representation of the original label space  $\mathbf{Y}$ , we can consider that Eq. (8) does not have local maximum, all its local minimums are global minimum, and all saddle points are strict [46].

**Lemma 3.3.** *Under the Assumption 2, Eq. (8) converges to a global minimum.*

Eq. (2) converges to a global minimum thanks to its external penalty which forces certain coefficients of  $\mathbf{W}$  to be null and thus reduces the dimensionality. More precisely, if  $n > m$  (i.e., low-dimension regime) the equation admits a unique convex solution even without external penalty. In the case of  $n \ll m$  (i.e., high-dimension regime), the equation admits an infinity of solutions which means that regularization is so necessary to approximate the low-dimensional regime and thus approximate the unique solution.

Eq. (8) is subject to high-dimensional regime and the regularization, this time, is not explicit but rather implicit via Hadamard product parameterization. Under the Assumptions 1 and 2, one can approximate the low-dimensional regime. Therefore, the equation converges to a global minimum even with a simple gradient descent but provided that the step size  $\eta$  is sufficiently small. Indeed, when the step size  $\eta$  is larger then the solution tends to move faster but at the risk of being local.

### 3.4 Time Complexity Analysis

The computational complexity of Algorithm 1 is presented by the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** *mFSIR is computed in time of  $O(nml + nlq + n^2l)$*

mFSIR is computationally efficient because it only requires simple multiplication operations in the alternative optimization process. The calculation of the derivative w.r.t  $\mathbf{G}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  is the

major contributor to the computational complexity. Specifically, it takes  $O(nml)$  to compute the derivatives w.r.t  $\mathbf{G}$  and w.r.t  $\mathbf{H}$ . The cost for solving the derivative w.r.t  $\mathbf{V}$  is  $O(nml + nlq + n^2l)$ . It needs  $O(nlq)$  to calculate the derivative w.r.t  $\mathbf{B}$ . In our case,  $l \ll n$ ,  $l \ll m$  and  $l < q$ . Therefore, the overall cost for mFSIR is  $O(nml + nlq + n^2l)$  in a single iteration.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we conduct a series of experiments on large scale datasets to validate the proposed framework. We compare our algorithm with other multi-label feature selection algorithms, followed by further analysis.

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

To validate the performance of our proposal, we conduct experiments on ten multi-label benchmark datasets. All datasets are available in MULAN Project<sup>1</sup>. Table 1 describes the characteristics of each multi-label dataset  $S$ , including the *number of examples* ( $|S|$ ), *number of features* ( $\dim(S)$ ), *number of class labels* ( $L(S)$ ), *label cardinality* ( $LCard(S)$ ), and *label density* ( $LDen(S)$ ).

TABLE 1  
Datasets

Datasets	domain	$ S $	$\dim(S)$	$L(S)$	$LCard(S)$	$LDen(S)$
<b>bibtex</b>	text	7395	1836	159	2.402	0.015
<b>Corel16k</b>	image	13770	500	153	2.859	0.019
<b>Delicious</b>	text (web)	16105	500	983	19.020	0.019
<b>emotions</b>	music	593	72	6	1.869	0.311
<b>Enron</b>	text	1702	1001	53	3.378	0.064
<b>Language log</b>	text	1460	1004	75	1.180	0.016
<b>medical</b>	text	978	1449	45	1.245	0.028
<b>scene</b>	image	2407	294	6	1.074	0.179
<b>tmc2007</b>	text	28596	500	22	2.158	0.098
<b>Yeast</b>	biology	2417	103	14	4.237	0.303

The performance of mFSIR is compared against one implicit regularization-based feature selection method and three explicit regularization-based multi-label feature selection methods. Below is a brief description of each of these representative methods.

- **MIFS**: Multi-label Informed Feature Selection. It exploits the latent label correlations to select discriminative features across multiple labels [38]. [parameter configuration:  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, \dots, 10\}$ ];
- **MICO**: A mutual-information-based feature selection method, which obtains the optimal solution via constrained convex optimization with less time [60]. [parameter configuration:  $\alpha, \beta \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, \dots, 10^3\}$ ];
- **GRRO**: Multi-label Feature Selection via Global Relevance and Redundancy Optimization. A general global optimization framework, in which feature relevance, label relevance and feature redundancy are taken into account to facilitate the multi-label feature selection [61]. [parameter configuration:  $\alpha, \beta \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, \dots, 10^3\}$ ,  $k=10$ ];
- **LassoNet**: A Neural Network with Feature Sparsity. It represents an extension of Lasso regression to feed-forward neural networks with global feature selection [62]. [parameter configuration:  $\lambda_{start}=5e-1$ ,  $\text{path\_multiplier}=1.05$ ,  $M = 10$ ].

LassoNet uses early stopping as an implicit regularization and can be considered as direct competitor of mFSIR. Note that it has

1. <http://mulan.sourceforge.net/datasets.html>

been adapted to multi-label selection since it is basically made for variable selection in single label.

For performance evaluation, we employ three metrics widely used in multi-label learning for comparison, including: Hamming loss, Ranking loss and Macro-averaging AUC [63] [64].

- *Hamming loss* [65] [24]:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|h(x_i) \oplus y_i\|_1}{C}$$

Here,  $h(x_i)$  is the predicted label-vector,  $y_i$  is the true label-vector, and  $\oplus$  stands for the XOR operation between  $h(x_i)$  and  $y_i$ .

- *Ranking loss* [66] [24]:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\{(y_s, y_t) \in Y_i \times \bar{Y}_i; f(x_i, y_s) \leq f(x_i, y_t)\}|}{|Y_i| |\bar{Y}_i|}$$

Here,  $\bar{Y}_i$  is the complementary set of  $Y_i$  in  $Y$ .

- *Macro-averaging AUC* [67]:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{|\{(x', x'') | f(x', y_j) \geq f(x'', y_j), (x', x'') \in a \times b\}|}{|a| |b|}$$

Here,  $a = \{x_i | y_j \in Y_i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ ,  $b = \{x_i | y_j \notin Y_i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$

For the first two evaluation metrics, the *smaller* the metric value the better the performance. For the other evaluation metric, the *larger* the metric value the better the performance.

Five-fold cross validation is done to split training and test sets. The number of selected features is varied from 5% to 30% of the total number of features. We adopt the MLkNN as a lazy classifier [68], and the parameter  $k$  is set as 10. The parameter  $\varpi$  is set as  $10^{-5}$ .

### 4.2 Experimental Results

In this section, we present and discuss the obtained results. Table 2 reports the average results (mean $\pm$ std) of each comparing feature selection algorithms over ten aforementioned datasets in terms of each evaluation metric.

In addition, we also use the non-parametric *Friedman test* as the statistical evaluation to analyze the relative performance among the comparing algorithms [69]. Let  $\gamma$  the number of algorithms,  $\theta$  the number of datasets (in our case,  $\gamma = 5$ ,  $\theta = 10$ ). Accordingly, let  $R_j = \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_i r_i^j$  denotes the average rank for the  $j$ -th algorithm over all datasets, with  $r_i^j$  the rank of the  $j$ -th of  $\gamma$  algorithms on the  $i$ -th of  $\theta$  datasets. Then, the Friedman statistic  $\mathcal{F}_F$  is calculated by Eq. (12) and is distributed according to the  $F$ -distribution with  $\gamma-1$  numerator degrees of freedom and  $(\gamma-1)(\theta-1)$  denominator degrees of freedom:

$$\mathcal{F}_F = \frac{(\theta-1) \mathcal{X}_2^F}{\theta(\gamma-1) - \mathcal{X}_2^F} \quad (12)$$

where,

$$\mathcal{X}_2^F = \frac{12\theta}{\gamma(\gamma+1)} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma} R_j^2 - \frac{\gamma(\gamma+1)^2}{4} \right] \quad (13)$$

TABLE 2

Experimental results of comparing approaches (mean $\pm$ std. deviation) on the ten datasets over three metrics. ( $\downarrow$ : the smaller the better;  $\uparrow$ : the larger the better). The marker  $\bullet/\circ$  indicates whether mFSIR is superior/inferior to the other method. win/tie/loss counts of pairwise  $t$ -test (at 1% significance level) between mFSIR and each comparing approach. A tie is counted and no marker is given.

Dataset	Hamming Loss $\downarrow$										win/tie/loss counts for mFSIR
	bibtex	Corel16k	Delicious	emotions	Enron	language log	medical	scene	tmc2007	Yeast	
MIFS	.011 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.023 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.019 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.341 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.234 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.020 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.017 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.172 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.137 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.205 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	5/0/5
MICO	.018 $\pm$ .014 $\bullet$	.052 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.022 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.269 $\pm$ .029 $\bullet$	.360 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.289 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.033 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.161 $\pm$ .006 $\bullet$	.165 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.230 $\pm$ .011 $\bullet$	9/0/1
GRRO	.015 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.021 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.020 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.273 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.228 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.291 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.011 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.245 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.103 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.312 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	7/0/3
LassoNet	.980 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.978 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.980 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.729 $\pm$ .027 $\bullet$	.937 $\pm$ .002 $\bullet$	.978 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.981 $\pm$ .003 $\bullet$	.799 $\pm$ .009 $\bullet$	.920 $\pm$ .006 $\bullet$	.744 $\pm$ .011 $\bullet$	10/0/0
<b>mFSIR</b>	.017 $\pm$ .000	.024 $\pm$ .000	.018 $\pm$ .000	.252 $\pm$ .006	.056 $\pm$ .001	.165 $\pm$ .002	.034 $\pm$ .000	.117 $\pm$ .003	.080 $\pm$ .000	.212 $\pm$ .001	-
Dataset	Ranking Loss $\downarrow$										win/tie/loss counts for mFSIR
	bibtex	Corel16k	Delicious	emotions	Enron	language log	medical	scene	tmc2007	Yeast	
MIFS	.218 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.136 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.260 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.452 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.375 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.170 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.098 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.125 $\pm$ .003 $\bullet$	.222 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.182 $\pm$ .007 $\circ$	2/0/8
MICO	.380 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.409 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.374 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.311 $\pm$ .062 $\bullet$	.368 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.314 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.111 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.245 $\pm$ .015 $\bullet$	.268 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.316 $\pm$ .018 $\circ$	3/0/7
GRRO	.470 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.392 $\pm$ .016 $\circ$	.289 $\pm$ .003 $\circ$	.281 $\pm$ .006 $\bullet$	.264 $\pm$ .005 $\circ$	.362 $\pm$ .023 $\bullet$	.081 $\pm$ .011 $\circ$	.220 $\pm$ .010 $\circ$	.149 $\pm$ .004 $\circ$	.297 $\pm$ .003 $\circ$	3/0/7
LassoNet	.818 $\pm$ .020 $\bullet$	.797 $\pm$ .008 $\bullet$	.822 $\pm$ .012 $\bullet$	.743 $\pm$ .053 $\bullet$	.877 $\pm$ .005 $\bullet$	.768 $\pm$ .029 $\bullet$	.958 $\pm$ .014 $\bullet$	.747 $\pm$ .020 $\bullet$	.900 $\pm$ .023 $\bullet$	.740 $\pm$ .013 $\bullet$	10/0/0
<b>mFSIR</b>	.568 $\pm$ .003	.756 $\pm$ .001	.721 $\pm$ .002	.271 $\pm$ .006	.615 $\pm$ .010	.312 $\pm$ .005	.626 $\pm$ .021	.105 $\pm$ .004	.324 $\pm$ .003	.433 $\pm$ .005	-
Dataset	Macro-averaging AUC $\uparrow$										win/tie/loss counts for mFSIR
	bibtex	Corel16k	Delicious	emotions	Enron	language log	medical	scene	tmc2007	Yeast	
MIFS	.518 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.034 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.602 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.252 $\pm$ .016 $\circ$	.161 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.221 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.156 $\pm$ .002 $\bullet$	.673 $\pm$ .005 $\bullet$	.436 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.596 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	7/0/3
MICO	.036 $\pm$ .018 $\bullet$	.011 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.063 $\pm$ .000 $\bullet$	.536 $\pm$ .067 $\circ$	.135 $\pm$ .001 $\bullet$	.115 $\pm$ .005 $\bullet$	.313 $\pm$ .055 $\circ$	.813 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.149 $\pm$ .000 $\circ$	.319 $\pm$ .046 $\circ$	7/0/3
GRRO	.049 $\pm$ .002 $\bullet$	.483 $\pm$ .021 $\circ$	.611 $\pm$ .003 $\circ$	.563 $\pm$ .008 $\circ$	.638 $\pm$ .001 $\circ$	.119 $\pm$ .002 $\bullet$	.351 $\pm$ .005 $\circ$	.795 $\pm$ .009 $\circ$	.847 $\pm$ .002 $\circ$	.320 $\pm$ .004 $\bullet$	3/0/7
LassoNet	.762 $\pm$ .034 $\circ$	.607 $\pm$ .030 $\circ$	.618 $\pm$ .049 $\circ$	.771 $\pm$ .027 $\circ$	.663 $\pm$ .025 $\circ$	.597 $\pm$ .021 $\circ$	.896 $\pm$ .044 $\circ$	.772 $\pm$ .020 $\circ$	.785 $\pm$ .064 $\circ$	.575 $\pm$ .024 $\circ$	0/0/10
<b>mFSIR</b>	.156 $\pm$ .004	.112 $\pm$ .001	.099 $\pm$ .003	.510 $\pm$ .015	.383 $\pm$ .004	.358 $\pm$ .012	.292 $\pm$ .011	.663 $\pm$ .011	.497 $\pm$ .002	.564 $\pm$ .004	-

TABLE 3

Summary of the Friedman statistics  $\mathcal{F}_F$  ( $\gamma=5$  and  $\theta=10$ ) and the critical value in terms of each evaluation metric ( $\gamma$ : # Comparing Algorithms;  $\theta$ : # Datasets)

Evaluation Metric	$\mathcal{F}_F$	critical value ( $\alpha=0.05$ )
Hamming loss	24.4	
Ranking loss	26.16	1.92
Macro-averaging AUC	18.64	

Table 3 lists the Friedman statistics  $\mathcal{F}_F$  and the corresponding critical value in terms of each evaluation metric, at significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ . According to Table 3, the null hypothesis of equal performance among the comparing approaches is clearly rejected ( $\mathcal{F}_F$  value is greater than the critical value **1.92** in terms of all evaluation metrics). Therefore, we use the *Nemenyi test* as a post-hoc test, to perform a pairwise comparison between the algorithms. The performance of two compared algorithms is deemed to be significantly different if the difference between their corresponding average ranks is larger than or equal to at least one critical distance (CD), which is calculated by Eq. (14).

$$CD = q_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\gamma(\gamma+1)}{6\theta}}. \quad (14)$$

where,  $q_\alpha$  is the critical value based on the studentized range statistics divided by  $\sqrt{2}$  [69]. Figure 1 shows the CD diagrams on each evaluation metric. Any comparing algorithm whose average rank is within one CD to that of mFSIR is interconnected to each other with a thick line (in our case,  $CD=1.92$ ). Otherwise, any algorithm not connected to mFSIR is considered to have significantly different performance from each other. The major observations resulting from the analysis of these results are as follows:

- As shown in Table 2, and according to the overall win/tie/loss counts across all datasets at the last column of each sub-table, our mFSIR is highly competitive with




Fig. 1. Comparison of mFSIR against other methods with the Nemenyi test.

other comparison algorithms in terms of all evaluation

metrics. To be specific, in terms of hamming loss, mFSIR outperforms the comparing algorithms in, 100% (LassoNet), 90% (MICO), 70% (GRRO), and 50% (MIFS) cases. In terms of ranking loss, mFSIR outperforms the comparing algorithms in, 100% (LassoNet), 30% (MICO), 30% (GRRO), and 20% (MIFS) cases. In terms of macro-averaging AUC, mFSIR outperforms the comparing algorithms in, 70% (MICO), 30% (GRRO), and 70% (MIFS) cases. These results mean that the implicit regularization with latent semantic is conducive to the performance improvement.

- According to Figure 1, mFSIR tops the ranking in terms of hamming loss and also in terms of running time. In addition, most comparison approaches achieve statistically comparable performance.

In a nutshell, these results convincingly validate the significance of our mFSIR approach, and therefore we can safely conclude that our framework is competitive with the other well-established multi-label learning approaches.

### 4.3 Further Analysis

#### 4.3.1 Influence of Selected Features

In this section, we study the impact of changing the number of selected features on the performance of mFSIR. We vary the number of selected instances from 5% to 30%. Experiment is conducted on four datasets, including: `emotions`, `language log`, `tmc2007` and `Yeast`. Figure 2 shows the performance comparison in terms of each evaluation metric across these aforementioned datasets. The major observations resulting from the analysis of these results are two-fold:

- The classification performance increases as the number of selected features increases, then keeps stable or even degrades when the number of selected features is large enough.
- Considering all the evaluation metrics, across the four datasets and with different numbers of selected features, mFSIR achieves highly competitive performance against the other multi-label feature selection methods. Thus, we can conclude that mFSIR benefits to the performance, and is effective in practice.

#### 4.3.2 Influence of Extra bias

As explained in section 2, the connection between the explicit regularization term and gradient descent optimization paths can lead to a less accurate estimation. That is, the resulting estimator, by this connection, may be dominated by the bias term due to the penalty, and the estimation error cannot fall below the penalty level to accommodate a possibly faster convergence rate. To show how our proposed can overcome the extra bias and lead to more accurate estimation, we experimentally study the convergence of mFSIR which adopts the implicitly-regularized gradient descent as well as MIFS adopting the explicit term  $l_{2,1}$ -norm. Figure 3 provides an illustration of convergence curves (mFSIR and MIFS) using some datasets. The following stop criteria is used:

$$\frac{\zeta^t - \zeta^{t-1}}{\zeta^{t-1}} \leq 10^{-5} \quad (15)$$

where  $\zeta^t$  represents the objective function value in the  $t^{\text{th}}$  iteration. As shown in Figure 3, the estimation error of mFSIR

is significantly lower than that of MIFS. This means that our proposed suffers significantly less from extra bias compared to MIFS and converges faster. Indeed even if MIFS ends up converging to the optimal solution, it results in a higher complexity than that of mFSIR. In contrast, mFSIR may find a solution that optimally balances between the model complexity and goodness fit of the model. For the four datasets `emotions`, `language log`, `tmc2007` and `Yeast`, mFSIR converges in 3 to 10 maximum iterations.

#### 4.3.3 Sparsity ensurement

In this section, we show how to empirically ensure the sparsity in optimal values  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  or  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ . As mentioned in section 3, we assume sparsity is ensured in these two optimal values if the initial values of  $\mathbf{G}$  or  $\mathbf{H}$  are superior or equal to zero. Thus, we compare the matrix of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  or  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$  after a random initialization of  $\mathbf{G}$  or  $\mathbf{H}$ , and after an initialization with values greater than or equal to zero. Figure 4, presents the qualitative results of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  using the `bibtex` dataset. From the figure, the initialization of  $\mathbf{G}$  is very related to sparsity. When we initialized  $\mathbf{G}$  with values greater than or equal to zero, we got a sparse matrix with columns containing the value zero (blue color). In contrast, when  $\mathbf{G}$  initialized randomly, we got a non-sparse matrix with columns containing different colors.

#### 4.3.4 Sensitivity Analysis

In this section, we conduct an experiment to see how the performance of mFSIR changes with varying parameter configurations  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  used to balance each term in equation Eq. (8). We tune both parameters from  $\{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 1, 10, 10^2\}$ . We also vary the number of selected features from  $\{5\%, 10\%, 15\%, 20\%, 25\%, 30\%\}$  of the total number of features. Figure 5 shows the performance of mFSIR across the `emotions` dataset in terms of each evaluation metric. To be specific, the first and second row (left subfigure) in the figure represent the performance of mFSIR in terms of hamming loss, ranking loss and macro-averaging AUC v.s. regularization parameter  $\alpha$  ( $\beta$  fixed as 1) and percentage of selected features. The second (right subfigure) and third row in the figure represent the performance of mFSIR in terms of the above three metrics v.s. regularization parameter  $\beta$  ( $\alpha$  fixed as 1) and percentage of selected features. From the figure, the performance of mFSIR is not very sensitive to the changes of parameters whose values change within a reasonable range. On the other hand, the performance of mFSIR is more sensitive to the number of selected features. Additionally, with respect to all three metrics, mFSIR performance increases as the number of features selected increases.

#### 4.3.5 Stability Analysis

Here, we use the spider web diagram to examine the stability of comparing algorithms on some multi-label datasets considering hamming loss metric. The spider web graph has different corners and lines of different colors. The corners represent the different datasets and the lines represent the different algorithms. The colored area surrounded by the colored line indicates the stability value of the algorithm. The rounder and larger the area, the more stable the algorithm. Based on [70], the prediction performance is normalized into  $[0, 0.5]$ . Note that a stability value close to 0.5 is considered significant. Figure 6 shows the stability index according to the hamming loss values after normalization. From the figure, mFSIR is more stable compared to other algorithms, as its area almost covers the spider web graph.




Fig. 2. Influence of selected feature number on four datasets emotions, language log, tmc2007 and Yeast.




Fig. 3. Convergence curves of mFSIR and MIFS on four datasets emotions, language log, tmc2007 and Yeast.

#### 4.3.6 Runtime Comparison

In this section, we illustrate the efficiency of the proposed mFSIR by comparing its running time (in second) with the other baseline approaches on some benchmark datasets. Table 4 shows the average running time required to reach the convergence state of each comparison approach. Overall, the running time varies according to the size of the dataset. Furthermore, mFSIR is relatively comparable to the other comparing approaches and exhibits competitive runtime performance on various datasets.

#### 4.3.7 Benign overfitting and implicit regularization

Here, we conduct empirical study to show that mFSIR can generalize thanks to the proposed implicit regularization and may exhibit the *benign overfitting* phenomenon in some datasets. Note that this phenomenon occurs when the predictor perfectly fits the training data while achieving near optimal loss. We train a baseline classifier on the `bibtex` dataset for 100 epochs and test whether the baseline classifier overfits the dataset in a benign way. More precisely, we train a baseline classifier on both original `bibtex` dataset (without mFSIR) and the `bibtex` dataset processed by our mFSIR approach (the number of selected features is set at 30%). Figure 7 shows the training and validation loss over the

TABLE 4

Performance comparison in terms of running time (sec) of different methods on some datasets. The symbol ‘-’ indicates that time cost is over 1000 seconds.

Datasets	MIFS	MICO	GRRO	LassoNet	mFSIR
bibtex	35.55	—	200.61	22.71	14.22
Corel16k	25.92	50.02	32.64	58.40	6.48
Delicious	111.76	—	—	57.79	37.94
emotions	0.61	0.64	0.05	104.54	0.15
Enron	4.24	30.20	13.20	30.73	1.06
language log	4.92	100.89	14.15	26.05	1.23
medical	4.40	193.50	20.90	80.08	1.11
scene	4.45	—	—	50.39	0.50
tmc2007	51.02	—	—	97.03	17.70
Yeast	1.18	0.95	0.23	36.31	0.37

aforementioned datasets. The figure also shows the training and validation Macro F1-score. The major observations resulting from the analysis of the figure are as follows:

- On the reduced `bibtex` dataset and using the two metrics, the validation performance closely approximates the training performance (Figure 7, right side). However, on






Fig. 4. **Different sparsity behaviors on bibtex dataset.** (a) represents the matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  initialized by values of  $\mathbf{G}$  superior or equal to zero. The subfigure is clearly sparse with columns containing the value zero (blue color). (b) represents the matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  initialized by random values of  $\mathbf{G}$ . The subfigure is clearly not sparse since the columns contain different colors.

the original bibtex dataset, the validation performance clearly deviates from training performance (Figure 7, left side). This means that benign overfitting can occur on datasets cleaned of noise and unnecessary informations.

- Using the concept of latent space can help reduce the dataset more reliably and therefore leads to benign overfitting.

## 5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper introduces a novel framework for multi-label feature selection. The proposed framework is based on a new estimator that overcomes the large bias and may lead to benign overfitting. The proposed estimator relies on implicit regularization via Hadamard product parametrization in conjunction with the latent semantic analysis. Experiments validate the effectiveness of our proposed, which outperforms state-of-the-arts on several benchmark datasets.

Our work opens up many interesting research directions, including the adaptation of implicit regularization to multi-label feature selection techniques in a semi-supervised context.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Gibaja and S. Ventura, "A tutorial on multilabel learning," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 1–38, 2015.
- [2] L. Feng, B. An, and S. He, "Collaboration based multi-label learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, 2019, pp. 3550–3557.
- [3] A. Panos, P. Dellaportas, and M. K. Titsias, "Large scale multi-label learning using gaussian processes," *Machine Learning*, vol. 110, no. 5, pp. 965–987, 2021.
- [4] X.-Q. Liu and X.-S. Liu, "Markov blanket and markov boundary of multiple variables," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1658–1707, 2018.




Fig. 5. Performance of mFSIR changes with varying hyper-parameter configurations  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  from  $\{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 1, 10, 10^2\}$ . Dataset: emotions; First and second row: hamming loss, ranking loss and macro-averaging AUC v.s. regularization parameter  $\alpha$  and percentage of selected features. Second and third row: hamming loss, ranking loss and macro-averaging AUC v.s. regularization parameter  $\beta$  and percentage of selected features.




Fig. 6. Spider Web Diagrams for stability index values considering Hamming loss metric on different multi-label datasets.

- [5] Y. Liu, K. Wen, Q. Gao, X. Gao, and F. Nie, "Svm based multi-label learning with missing labels for image annotation," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 78, pp. 307–317, 2018.
- [6] K. Kundu and J. Tighe, "Exploiting weakly supervised visual patterns to learn from partial annotations," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, 2020.
- [7] J. Liu, W.-C. Chang, Y. Wu, and Y. Yang, "Deep learning for extreme multi-label text classification," in *Proceedings of the 40th International*




Fig. 7. **Different overfitting behaviors on `bibtex` dataset.** *Left*: training and validation (loss and Macro F1-score) over the original `bibtex` (without mFSIR). *Right*: training and validation (loss and Macro F1-score) over the reduced `bibtex` (with mFSIR, 30% of selected features). A baseline classifier non-benignly overfits the original `bibtex`, while it benignly overfits the reduced `bibtex`.

- ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2017, pp. 115–124.
- [8] J. Lee, I. Yu, J. Park, and D.-W. Kim, “Memetic feature selection for multilabel text categorization using label frequency difference,” *Information Sciences*, vol. 485, pp. 263–280, 2019.
- [9] S. J. Fodeh and A. Tiwari, “Exploiting medline for gene molecular function prediction via nmf based multi-label classification,” *Journal of biomedical informatics*, vol. 86, pp. 160–166, 2018.
- [10] Z.-A. Huang, J. Zhang, Z. Zhu, E. Q. Wu, and K. C. Tan, “Identification of autistic risk candidate genes and toxic chemicals via multilabel learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2020.
- [11] X. Wu, B. Jiang, K. Yu, H. Chen, and C. Miao, “Multi-label causal feature selection.” in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 6430–6437.
- [12] M. Lapin, M. Hein, and B. Schiele, “Analysis and optimization of loss functions for multiclass, top-k, and multilabel classification,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 1533–1554, 2017.
- [13] J. Ma and T. W. Chow, “Topic-based algorithm for multilabel learning with missing labels,” *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 2138–2152, 2018.
- [14] J. Huang, G. Li, Q. Huang, and X. Wu, “Joint feature selection and classification for multilabel learning,” *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 876–889, 2017.
- [15] R. B. Pereira, A. Plastino, B. Zadrozny, and L. H. Merschmann, “Categorizing feature selection methods for multi-label classification,” *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 57–78, 2018.
- [16] Y. Zhang, J. Wu, Z. Cai, and S. Y. Philip, “Multi-view multi-label learning with sparse feature selection for image annotation,” *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2020.
- [17] P. E. Hart, D. G. Stork, and R. O. Duda, *Pattern classification*. Wiley Hoboken, 2000.
- [18] R. Kohavi and G. H. John, “Wrappers for feature subset selection,” *Artificial intelligence*, vol. 97, no. 1-2, pp. 273–324, 1997.
- [19] R. Tibshirani, “Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 267–288, 1996.
- [20] F. Nie, H. Huang, X. Cai, and C. Ding, “Efficient and robust feature selection via joint  $\ell_2$ ,  $\ell_1$ -norms minimization,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 23, pp. 1813–1821, 2010.
- [21] Y. Zhang and Z.-H. Zhou, “Multilabel dimensionality reduction via dependence maximization,” *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 1–21, 2010.
- [22] L. Jian, J. Li, K. Shu, and H. Liu, “Multi-label informed feature selection.” in *IJCAI*, 2016, pp. 1627–1633.
- [23] M. Paniri, M. B. Dowlatshahi, and H. Nezamabadi-Pour, “Mlaco: A multi-label feature selection algorithm based on ant colony optimization,” *Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 192, p. 105285, 2020.
- [24] A. Alalga, K. Benabdeslem, and D. E. K. Mansouri, “3-3fs: ensemble method for semi-supervised multi-label feature selection,” *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 2969–2999, 2021.
- [25] Z. Zhang, L. Liu, J. Li, and X. Wu, “Integrating global and local feature selection for multi-label learning,” *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 2022.
- [26] C. Shi, Q. Ruan, S. Guo, and Y. Tian, “Sparse feature selection based on  $\ell_2$ ,  $\ell_2/2$ -matrix norm for web image annotation,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 151, pp. 424–433, 2015.
- [27] Y. Shi, J. Miao, and L. Niu, “Feature selection with  $mcp^2$  regularization,” *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 6699–6709, 2019.
- [28] J. Fan and R. Li, “Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, vol. 96, no. 456, pp. 1348–1360, 2001.
- [29] E. D. Vito, L. Rosasco, A. Caponnetto, U. D. Giovannini, and F. Odone, “Learning from examples as an inverse problem,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 6, no. May, pp. 883–904, 2005.
- [30] Y. Yao, L. Rosasco, and A. Caponnetto, “On early stopping in gradient descent learning,” *Constructive Approximation*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 289–315, 2007.
- [31] P. D. Hoff, “Lasso, fractional norm and structured sparse estimation using a hadamard product parametrization,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, vol. 115, pp. 186–198, 2017.
- [32] Z. Li, W. J. Su, and D. Sejdinovic, “Benign overfitting and noisy features,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 1–13, 2022.
- [33] M. Zhou and R. Ge, “Implicit regularization leads to benign overfitting for sparse linear regression,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00257*, 2023.
- [34] O. Shamir, “The implicit bias of benign overfitting,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 24, no. 113, pp. 1–40, 2023.
- [35] S. Deerwester, S. T. Dumais, G. W. Furnas, T. K. Landauer, and R. Harshman, “Indexing by latent semantic analysis,” *Journal of the American society for information science*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 391–407, 1990.

- [36] T. K. Landauer, P. W. Foltz, and D. Laham, "An introduction to latent semantic analysis," *Discourse processes*, vol. 25, no. 2-3, pp. 259–284, 1998.
- [37] S. T. Dumais, "Latent semantic analysis," *Annual review of information science and technology*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 188–230, 2004.
- [38] L. Jian, J. Li, and H. Liu, "Exploiting multilabel information for noise-resilient feature selection," *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1–23, 2018.
- [39] Z.-F. He, M. Yang, Y. Gao, H.-D. Liu, and Y. Yin, "Joint multi-label classification and label correlations with missing labels and feature selection," *Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 163, pp. 145–158, 2019.
- [40] J. Hu, Y. Li, W. Gao, and P. Zhang, "Robust multi-label feature selection with dual-graph regularization," *Knowledge-Based Systems*, p. 106126, 2020.
- [41] Y. Fan, J. Liu, P. Liu, Y. Du, W. Lan, and S. Wu, "Manifold learning with structured subspace for multi-label feature selection," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 120, p. 108169, 2021.
- [42] R. Huang and Z. Wu, "Multi-label feature selection via manifold regularization and dependence maximization," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 120, p. 108149, 2021.
- [43] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals, "Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 107–115, 2021.
- [44] A. Rakitianskaia and A. Engelbrecht, "Measuring saturation in neural networks," in *2015 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1423–1430.
- [45] T. Vaskevicius, V. Kanade, and P. Rebeschini, "Implicit regularization for optimal sparse recovery," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019, pp. 2972–2983.
- [46] P. Zhao, Y. Yang, and Q.-C. He, "Implicit regularization via hadamard product over-parametrization in high-dimensional linear regression," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.09367*, 2019.
- [47] N. S. Chatterji, P. M. Long, and P. L. Bartlett, "The interplay between implicit bias and benign overfitting in two-layer linear networks," *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 23, no. 263, pp. 1–48, 2022.
- [48] K. Yu, S. Yu, and V. Tresp, "Multi-label informed latent semantic indexing," in *Proceedings of the 28th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, 2005, pp. 258–265.
- [49] C. Zhang, Z. Yu, Q. Hu, P. Zhu, X. Liu, and X. Wang, "Latent semantic aware multi-view multi-label classification," in *Thirty-second AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2018, pp. –.
- [50] I. Kononenko, "Estimating attributes: Analysis and extensions of relief," in *European conference on machine learning*. Springer, 1994, pp. 171–182.
- [51] D. Kong, C. Ding, H. Huang, and H. Zhao, "Multi-label relief and f-statistic feature selections for image annotation," in *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 2352–2359.
- [52] D. B. Skalak, "Prototype and feature selection by sampling and random mutation hill climbing algorithms," in *Machine Learning Proceedings 1994*. Elsevier, 1994, pp. 293–301.
- [53] K.-B. Duan, J. C. Rajapakse, H. Wang, and F. Azuaje, "Multiple svm-rfe for gene selection in cancer classification with expression data," *IEEE transactions on nanobioscience*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 228–234, 2005.
- [54] B. Efron, T. Hastie, I. Johnstone, and R. Tibshirani, "Least angle regression," *The Annals of statistics*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 407–499, 2004.
- [55] X.-F. Song, Y. Zhang, Y.-N. Guo, X.-Y. Sun, and Y.-L. Wang, "Variable-size cooperative coevolutionary particle swarm optimization for feature selection on high-dimensional data," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 882–895, 2020.
- [56] Y. Zhang, Q. Wang, D.-w. Gong, and X.-f. Song, "Nonnegative laplacian embedding guided subspace learning for unsupervised feature selection," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 93, pp. 337–352, 2019.
- [57] P. Zhao, Y. Yang, and Q.-C. He, "High-Dimensional Linear Regression via Implicit Regularization," *Biometrika*, vol. 109, no. 4, p. 1033–1046, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asac010>
- [58] C. Ding, T. Li, W. Peng, and H. Park, "Orthogonal nonnegative matrix t-factorizations for clustering," in *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2006, pp. 126–135.
- [59] D. Cai, C. Zhang, and X. He, "Unsupervised feature selection for multi-cluster data," in *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2010, pp. 333–342.
- [60] Z. Sun, J. Zhang, L. Dai, C. Li, C. Zhou, J. Xin, and S. Li, "Mutual information based multi-label feature selection via constrained convex optimization," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 329, pp. 447–456, 2019.
- [61] J. Zhang, Y. Lin, M. Jiang, S. Li, Y. Tang, and K. C. Tan, "Multi-label feature selection via global relevance and redundancy optimization," in *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 2512–2518.
- [62] I. Lemhadri, F. Ruan, L. Abraham, and R. Tibshirani, "Lassonet: A neural network with feature sparsity," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 127, pp. 1–29, 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/20-848.html>
- [63] G. Tsoumakas and I. Katakis, "Multi-label classification: An overview," *International Journal of Data Warehousing and Mining (IJDWM)*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 1–13, 2007.
- [64] M. Xu, Y.-F. Li, and Z.-H. Zhou, "Robust multi-label learning with pro loss," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 1610–1624, 2019.
- [65] X.-Z. Wu and Z.-H. Zhou, "A unified view of multi-label performance measures," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 3780–3788.
- [66] Y. Li, Y. Song, and J. Luo, "Improving pairwise ranking for multi-label image classification," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 3617–3625.
- [67] M.-L. Zhang, J.-P. Fang, and Y.-B. Wang, "Bilabel-specific features for multi-label classification," *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2021.
- [68] M.-L. Zhang and Z.-H. Zhou, "MI-knn: A lazy learning approach to multi-label learning," *Pattern recognition*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 2038–2048, 2007.
- [69] J. Demšar, "Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 7, pp. 1–30, 2006.
- [70] J. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Li, W. Weng, and S. Wu, "Online multi-label streaming feature selection based on neighborhood rough set," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 84, pp. 273–287, 2018.